

## DAṆḌIN'S « KĀVYĀDARŚA » IN TIBET AND MONGOLIA

AS it is well known the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* was an outstanding achievement of ancient Indian theory on poetry. It is one of the best works which had ever been written by Indian theorists on *Alaṃkāra* literature.

It is almost unknown to the modern world that the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* enjoyed for centuries such a great popularity in Nepal, Tibet and Mongolia that it had found its second home in these countries. The Tibetans and Mongols not only skillfully translated the *Kāvyādarśa* into their own languages but they have been writing numerous commentaries to this treatise beginning from the XIII century up to the modern epoch. And one should not underestimate the importance of these commentaries for the study of the Daṇḍin's theory both in India itself and other countries.

The data of Tibetan sources show that the *Kāvyādarśa* first spread into Tibet in the XIII century through Nepal, the India's nearest neighbour which by that time was a great centre of Indian Buddhist culture and learning. It was in Nepal that the founders of Indian *Alaṃkāra* theory and Sanskrit studies in Tibet the famous Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dGa' rGyal-mTshan (1182-1251), Son-sTon rDo-rje rGyal-mTshan (XIII century), dPan-sTon bLo-gRos brTan-pa (1276-1342) studied the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, the Sanskrit language and grammar. From the letter written in 1258 by Pags-pa bLa-ma bLo-gRos rGyal-mTshan (1235-1280) to the Indian paṇḍita Lakṣmimākara it becomes clear that this greatest connoisseur of the Sanskrit language and literature, the co-translator of the *Kāvyādarśa* into Tibetan was invited from Nepal to Tibet, to the Sa-skya monastery with the special purpose to help the Tibetans to translate Sanskrit literary works<sup>1</sup>. It was Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dGa'

1. See: Sa-skya bka-bum (The collection of works by the abbots of the Sa-skya monastery) Vol.ba, f. 14b/265b-15b/266b. Cf. SH. BIRA, *Two letters written by Pags-pa bla-ma to Lakṣmi-makara and Son-ston rDo-rje rGyal-mTshan, the translators of the Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa. Problems of history, culture and historiography of the MPR* (Selected works), Ulan-Bator, 1977, pp. 372-378.

rGyal-mTshan who was the first to translate some passages from the *Kāvyādarśa* into Tibetan in his work called « mkhas-pa rnam 'jug pa'i sgo žes bya ba'i bstan bčos » (Sastra entitled « How to become learned »). In his translation he frequently quoted the commentary called in Tibetan « dbyaṅs čan gyi mgul rgyan » which I identify with the Indian commentary « Sarasvatikanṭhabharana » (« Ornament of the neck of Sarasvatī ») ascribed to the authorship of the famous king Bhoja of Dhārā (XI-century). I counted that about 660 feet (pāda) of verses from the *Kāvyādarśa* are to be found translated by Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dGa' rGyal-mTshan in his above mentioned work. The comparative study shows that the Sa-skya paṇḍita's translation of some stanzas from the *Kāvyādarśa* is rather close to that of the relevant passages made by Šon-sTon rDo-rje rGyal-mTshan, the translator of the first full Tibetan translation of Daṇḍin's work.

One can say that there is no great divergences in the understanding of the meaning of the respective passages of the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* by the two translators. Of course there are some differences in style and techniques of translating or in giving Tibetan equivalents to Sanskrit expressions, terms and words. Let me give a few examples:

*Example N. 1 - The Sanskrit original:*

*śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhyamaṁ sukumāratā /  
arthavyaktirudāratvamojaḥkāntisamādhayaḥ //  
iti vaidarbhamārgasya prāṇā daśa guṇāḥ smṛtāḥ/  
eṣāṁ viparyayaḥ prāyo dṛśyate gauḍavartmaṇi // (1.41-42)*

*The Sa-skya paṇḍita's translation:*

'brel dañ rab gsal mñam pa ñid //  
sñan dañ rab tu gžon pa dañ //  
don gsal ba dañ go bde ba //  
brjid dañ mdzes dañ tiñ  
ñe 'dzin //  
yon tan 'di bču vaidharbha'i //  
lam gyi srog du bsad pa yin //  
'di rnam phal čer bzlog pa ni //  
gouḍa'i lam du mtshon par bya //

*The Šon-sTon's translation:*

spyar ba rab draṅs mñam ñid dañ //  
sñam dañ śin tu gžon pa dañ //  
don gsal ba dañ rgya čhe dañ //  
brjid dañ mdzes dañ tiñ  
ñe 'dzin //  
yon tan 'di bču vaidharbha'i //  
lam gyi srog tu bsad pa yin //  
'di dag phal čer bzlog pas ni //  
gouḍa'i lam dag mtshon pa yin //

The English translation<sup>2</sup>:

Slesha (compact), Prasada (charity), Samata (evenness), Madhuryam (sweetness), Sukumarata (elegance), Arthavyakti (expressiveness), Udatvam (excellence), Ojas (vigour), Kanti and Samadhi (structure) -these ten characteristics are considered to belong to the Vidarbha path. In the gouda path, the opposite of these characteristics is often found.

Example N. 2 - The Sanskrit original:

*Tundairātāmrakuṭilaiḥ pakṣairharita-komalai /  
Trivarnarājibhiḥ: kāṇṭhāirete mañjugirāḥ śukāḥ / (2.9)*

The Sa-skya paṇḍita's translation:

mčhu ni śin tu dmar žin gug //  
gśog pa ljañ ser 'jam pa po //  
mgrin pa kha dog gsum gyis bres //  
ne tso 'di ni 'jam pa'i nag //

The Son-sTon's translation:

mčhu ni dmar žin gug pa dañ //  
gśog pa ljañ žin mñen pa dañ //  
mgrin pa kha dog sum phren čan //  
ne tso 'di dag tshig 'jam ldan //

The English translation:

Here are these parrots  
of sweet speech, with  
red curved beaks, with  
feathers of tender green  
hue and with shining  
tri-coloured throats.

Example N. 3 - The Sanskrit original:

*Kalakkaṇṭagatagarbheṇa kaṇṭhenāghūrṇitekṣaṇaḥ /  
pārāvataḥ paribhramya riraṃsuścumbati priyām / (2.10)*

The Sa-skya paṇḍita's translation:

sñan pa'i sgra yi sñin po yis //  
mgrin pa kun nas spur ba'i mig //  
phug ron kun nas bskor ba yis //  
rtse 'dod dga' ma la mčhu ster //

The Son-sTon's translation:

mgrin pa'i nañ nas sñan grags śin //  
mig ni kun tu 'phrul pa yi //  
phug ron rtse 'dod dga' ma la //  
yoñs su bskor nas mčhu dag spyor //

2. The English translation belong to V. Narayana Ayer. *Kāvyaḍarśa* by Daṇḍin. Introduction and notes in English by V. Narayana Ayer, Madras, 1964, pp. 21-22. Further the English translations will be given according to V. Narayana Ayer.

*The English translation:*

The pigeon desirous of  
sporting (with its beloved)  
and rolling its eyes  
(in passion) and with  
its throat full of  
tremulous cooing  
kisses its beloved.

The first complete Tibetan translation of the *Kāvyādarśa* which layed the real foundations to the studies of Daṇḍin's theory in Tibet and lately in Mongolia was made on the initiative of Sa-skya bla-ma 'Pags-pa bLo-gRos rGyal-mTshan who, as it is well known, was an Imperial preceptor of the Mongol (Yuan) dynasty in China during the reign of Qubilai-khan and his disciple Sa-skya bZaṅ-po, the first Regent (dpon-chen) in Tibet appointed by Qubilai-khan for conducting the secular affairs of Tibet on behalf of the *Khan*. The translator were the two above-mentioned *paṇḍitas* Son-sTon and śri Lakṣimākara. The date of the translation is not indicated but it is quite certain that the first Tibetan translation was made between 1258 and 1280. Our opinion is based on the following data. In the above-mentioned letter from 1258 'Pags-pa bLa-ma bLo-gRos rGyal-mTshan expressed his satisfaction on the occasion of the first meeting of Son-sTon rDo-rje rGyal-mTshan and śri Lakṣimākara. It means that the two translators could have started their translation of the *Kāvyādarśa* only after 1258. And according to the colophon of the Tibetan translation of the *Kāvyādarśa* its translation was made on the initiative and during the life time of 'Pags-pa bla-ma who died in 1280.

Son-sTon's translation was lately revised by a number of lo-tshā-bas-translators: The above-mentioned dPan-sTon bLo-gRos brTan-pa, the younger brother of Son-sTon rDo-rje rGyal-mTshan, *mahāpaṇḍita* Chos-sKyon bZaṅ-pa (1441-1527), sñe-Than bLo-gRos brTan-pa.

After its translation the *Kāvyādarśa* was widely spread in Tibet. It has become one of the compulsory subjects of the Buddhist learning there. Tibetan authors wrote a great many of commentaries on the *Kāvyādarśa* which are of the greatest importance for the study of Daṇḍin's theory. They composed much more commentaries on the *Kāvyādarśa* than even the Indians themselves. It is not possible to enumerate all these commentaries in a short paper<sup>3</sup>.

Valuable Tibetan commentaries on the *Kāvyādarśa* many of which have become inaccessible outside Tibet are enlisted by Akhu-Rin-po-che Śes-Rab rGyal-mTshan (1803-1875) in his book «List of rare books». To mention only a few of them are the Son-sTon's «dbyaṅs-čan mgul-

3. See some of these commentaries: C. DAMDINSUREN, *The Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa and its commentaries* (In Mongolian), Studia Mongolica, 1962, vol. IV, fasc. I, pp. 3-23.

rgyan» (The neck-ornament of Sarasvatī), the dPañ-sTon bLo-gRos brTan-pa's «sNan ṅag 'grelba gžun don gsal ba» or, as it was usually called, «dPañ ṭi-kā» («Commentary on the *Kāvyādarśa* making clear the meaning of the basic text»), the sNar-thaṅ lo-tṣā ba Samghaśrī's «ṭikā bklag pas don grub» («Commentary so called gaining the object after having read it»), the sDe-pa Rin-sPuṅs-pa ṅag-dBaṅ 'jig-rTen's «sNan ṅag me-loṅ gi 'grel-ba mi 'jigs seṅ ge'i rgyud kyi ṅa ro» («Commentary on the *Kāvyādarśa* so called «A roar of a fearless lion») etc. It should be mentioned that a discovery of any of these rare commentaries anywhere in the world would be a great piece of luck for modern science.

Out of the commentaries which were very popular both in Tibet and Mongolia and could be found in the Tibetan fund of the State library in Ulan-Bator one should name the following: the Bod-mKhas-pa Mi-pham dGe-leg rNam-rGyal's «sNan ṅag gi bstan bčos čhen po me loṅ la 'jug pa'i bśad sbyar daṇḍi'i dgoṅs rgyan» («Introductory commentary on the *Kāvyādarśa* so-called «An Ornament of Daṇḍin's Opinion»); his another commentary «sNan ṅag me loṅ gZuṅ giṣ bstan pa'i dper brjod legs par bśad pa sgra dbyaṅs rgya mtsho'i 'jug ṅog» («Good explication of examples given in the basic text of the *Kāvyādarśa* so-called «A ford of the Ocean of pleasing tones»); the V Dalai-lama ṅag-dBaṅ bLo-bZaṅ rGya-mTsho's (1617-1682) «sNan ṅag me loṅ gi dka' 'grel dbyaṅs čan dgyes pa'i glu dbyaṅs» («Comments on the difficult places of the *Kāvyādarśa* so-called «Singing to be pleased by Sarasvatī») and others. The V Dalai-lama's commentary was a real manual for those who studied the *Kāvyādarśa* in Tibet and Mongolia during the last two centuries. It is one of the best commentaries which had ever been written by Tibetan authors.

One should suppose that the *Kāvyādarśa* became known to the Mongols during the period of the Mongol Empire. Such Mongolian authors as Choiḷi-Odser, Sharab-Senge and others who knew so well the old Indian literature might have been familiar with the theory of Daṇḍin.

Nevertheless the real studies of the *Kāvyādarśa* in Mongolia began much later, that's in the XVII century. The Mongols got acquainted with the *Kāvyādarśa* thanks to the Tibetans. They studied Daṇḍin's theory in Tibetan, in the above said Tibetan translation of Ṣon-sTon and śrī Lakṣmākara.

I think that one of the first Mongolian learned lamas who studied the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* was Khalkha Zaya paṇḍita Lubsanprenlei (1642-1715). He could be called a founder of the studies of the *Kāvyādarśa* in Mongolia. In his four volume book «The clear mirror» he says that during his studies in Tibet from 1660 to 1679 he studied the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* with his Tibetan teacher Rin-po-čhe bLo-bZaṅ Choi-grags dPal-bZaṅ-po. From Tibetan commentaries he studied mainly the

abovenamed commentaries by the V Dalai-lama, the *mahāpaṇḍita* b-Lo-bZaṅ Nor-bu's « Don rgyan so lha'i dper brjod » (« The examples on the 35 Arthālaṃkara ») and others.

He himself composed a small book called « Don rgyan so lha'i dper brjod pa tshaṅ sras dgyes pa'i glu dbyaṅs » (« The examples on the 35 Arthālaṃkara, so-called « The Singing which delights Sarasvatī »).

Following Lubsanprenlei Mongolian learned lamas studied widely the *Kāvyādarśa* and wrote quite a number of commentaries. It is characteristic that they wrote their works exclusively in the Tibetan language which was not only a main language of the Buddhist church but, to some extent, a language of learning in old Mongolia. One should say that unlike the Tibetans the Mongol authors did little to apply the Daṇḍin's theory to their native tongue. This is, I think, a lack of the Mongol authors who wrote books on the Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*. Following the Tibetan authorities on Daṇḍin's theory they mostly dealt with the general rules of the *Kāvyādarśa* in the Tibetan language. They continued the tradition of studying of the *Kāvyādarśa* upto the Modern time. This fact, I hope, could not be neglected by those who study the history of the Kāvya literature in India and other Asian countries. I would not want to go into details concerning the Mongol commentaries because I and my Mongol colleagues had already written on this subject<sup>4</sup>. This time I would like to say a few words about the Mongolian translation of the *Kāvyādarśa*.

The translation of the *Kāvyādarśa* into Mongolian was a notable event in the literary and translator's activities of the Mongols and widened the circles of its readers. The Mongolian translation was made from the Tibetan language by gushi Gelegjaltsan, the disciple of Khalkha Bogdo Jebtsundamba and was included into 205th volume of the Mongolian Danjur. The date of the translation is not indicated but I suppose that it was made during the period when the translation of the Danjur into Mongolian was going to be completed in the XVIII century.

We know very little of the translator. It is only known that he also translated from Tibetan into Mongolian the famous treatise on prosody *Candoratnākara* by Sarvajña Ratnākaraśanti and the autocommentary to this treatise by the same author. Ratnākaraśanti says that he decided to write his book because the *Candosūtra* by Piṅgala was « too short and unclear in some places ».

In comparing the Mongolian, Tibetan and English<sup>5</sup> translations

---

4. SH. BIRA, *Mongolian commentaries on Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa. Problems of history, culture and historiography* (Selected works), Ulan-Bator, 1977, pp. 338-351. The above-mentioned article by C. Damdinsuren, CH. ALTANGEREL, *About a Mongol commentary on Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa* (In Mongolian), The Second International Congress of Mongolists, vol. I, pp. 41-48.

5. I used the English translation by V. Narayana Ayer. Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* with an introduction and English translation, Madras, 1952.

with the Sanskrit original of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* I discovered that though these translations were made into quite different languages by different translators in different centuries there are no great divergences in the understanding and rendering of the original in the corresponding languages. This fact shows that the Sanskrit text of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* has been firmly preserved in its original form during many centuries not growing into various versions and interpolations. On the other hand the fact shows that these three translations are equally close and adequate to the original. But it does not mean that the three translations are equally good in quality and equally important for the study of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*.

Our comparative studies show that the Tibetan translation of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* made by Son-sTon and sri Lakṣmākara is remarkable for its high skill and precise understanding of every shade of the meaning of the original. I would say that the Tibetan translation is not only the earliest but the best one among all the existing translations of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*.

As far as the Mongolian translation is concerned, it is a typical example of the verbatim translation which was characteristic for the whole translation of the Buddhist literature into the Mongolian language.

I would say that there were advantages and disadvantages of such a method of translation. The advantage is that the word for word translation excluded the possibility of digressing of the translator from the original turning the translation into a mechanically adequate rendering of the Tibetan version of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* into Mongolian.

The Tibetan translation of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* distinguishes itself in its adequacy to the Sanskrit original and that is why the Mongolian translation turned out also to be rather close to the Sanskrit version. The disadvantage of the verbatim translation is that the word for word rendering into Mongolian from such an unrelated language as Tibetan made the meaning of the original incomprehensible and unclear in many places. Such a method of translating violated the norms of the Mongolian literary language. I shall illustrate my opinion by some examples. There are not so few places in the Mongolian translation which are very close to the original but quite understandable for a Mongolian reader.

*Example N. 1 - Sanskrit original:*

*caturmukhamukhāmbhojavanahaṃsavadhūrmama /  
mānase ramatām nityam sarvaśhuklā sarasvatī //* (1.1)

*The Tibetan translation:*

*gdon bži gdon gi pad tshal gyi / nan pa'i bu mo thams čad dkar /  
dbyaṅs čan ma ni kho po yi / yid la riṅ du gnas par mdzod //*

*The Mongolian translation:*

cadurmuka<sup>6</sup>-yin niγur-teki lingqu-a-yin sečerlig-tür γala-γun-u okin  
metü qamuγ-a čaγan önggetü sarasvadi-či minu jirüken-dür nasuda  
saγun soyuraq-a //

*The English translation by V. Narayana Ayer:*

May the lovely lady swan that sports among the lotus-mouths of  
Brahma, the all-white Sarasvatī roam for ever in delight in the  
lotus-pool of my heart.

*Example N. 2 - The Sanskrit original:*

jīvitāśā balavatī dhanāśā durbalā mama /  
gaccha vā tiṣṭha vā kānta / svāvasthā tu niveditā // (2.139)  
asāvanādarākṣepo yadanādaravadvacah /  
priyaprayāṇaṃ rundhatyā prayuktam iha raktayā // (2.140)

*The Tibetan translation:*

bdag ni gson re stobs dañ ldan / nor gyi bsam pa stobs ldan min /  
mdza' bo gśegs sam bžugs lags sam / rañ gi gnas skabs smos pa  
lags / gañ phyir 'di ni čhags ldan mas / ma gus bžin du tshig sbyar  
nas / mdza' bo'i bgrod pa 'gog byed pa / 'di ni ma gus 'gog pao. //

*The Mongolian translation:*

bi-inu amidu-yi egereküi küčün-lüge tegüsümüi, ed-i setgekü-yin tula  
küčün-lüge tegüsügsen busu, amaraγ-a, ajiraqu buyu-ou saγuqu-ou,  
öber-ün aqu učir-i ügülegsen bolai.

Alin-u tulada ene-inu tačiyangγui tegülder eke-ber amaraγ-un yabu-  
dal-i itqan üiledüged ülü taγalan bögetele üyes-i nayiraγuluγsan  
ese-inu ülü taγalaqu-ber türedkekü bolai.

*The English translation by V. Narayana Ayer:*

« Desire to live is strong in me and desire for riches is weak in  
me, beloved! Either go or stay (as you choose); the condition (of  
my mind) has been represented (to you). This is anadarakshepa  
(or objection involving sullen indifference) because words are here  
used by a loving lady in sullen indifference for preventing the  
departure of her lover ».

It should be said that there are places in the Mongolian translation  
where the real meaning of the original is not clear or even not under-  
standable at all.

Here I'll give only one example:

*The Mongolian translation:*

Üjesküleng-tü eke činu soγtaγči ulaγan niγur qačar ulaγan uda-  
bala-yin nidü-tü egün-i ber törülkiten-e ulaγan-a činar-a üyiledbei.

6. It is interesting that the Mongol translator used the Sanskrit epithet for  
Brahma (Caturmukha), though the Tibetan translator gave the Tibetan equivalent  
to the Sanskrit *abhidhan* or epithet (gdoñ bži).



This is the translation of the following Sanskrit verse:

*madapāṭalagaṇḍena raktanetrotpalena te /*

*mukhena mugḍhaḥ sopy eṣa jano rāgamayaḥ kṛtaḥ // (2.75)*

by your face which has red eye-blue-lotuses, and which has cheeks red with intoxication even this person has been attracted and made full of colour (love).

The correct Mongolian translation would be:

üjesküleng-tü eke činu udabala-yin ulaγan nidü-tü soγtaγči ulaγan qačar-tu činu niγur-anu eneku torulkiten-i ču ulaγan činar-tu bolγan üyiledbei.

It should be noted that the Mongolian translator Gelegjaltsan gives many Mongolian equivalents of the Sanskrit figurative words having mechanically translated them from Tibetan. In practice, this was rather unusual in those days for the Mongolian literary activity.

The translation has become in some places not so understandable to Mongolian readers. It must be said that though the Mongolian translators of Indian poetical works used many Mongolian equivalents to Sanskrit figurative words; these translation loan words did not penetrate into the vocabulary of the Mongolian language. In this connection the Mongolian language was quite different from the Tibetan language which made its own all its equivalents from Sanskrit.

Gelegjaltsan gives such Mongolian equivalents in his translation as: šibar-ača urγuγsan (lotus) > Tibetan 'dam skyes > Sanskrit manjarī;

Sedkil-i qudqγčī (epithet of Kamadeva) > Tibetan yid bsrubs > Sanskrit manmatha,

Ünür-i külgelegči (wind) > Tibetan dri bžon > Sanskrit gandha-vaha,

qoyar törügči (Brahma or moon) > Tibetan gñis skyes dbanpo > Sanskrit dvijeśvara,

güregesün nidü-tü (beautiful lady) > Tibetan ri drags mig > Sanskrit harinekaṣanā etc.

At the present moment the Mongolian scholars are engaged in studying the Tibetan and Mongolian translations of and commentaries by Tibetan and Mongolian authors to the *Kāvyaḍarśa*. We are going to make a new Mongolian translation from the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions of the *Kāvyaḍarśa* into Modern Mongolian on the basis of the old Mongolian translation using the Tibetan and Mongolian commentaries.

Ulan-Bator.